



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/657,726

09/08/2003

Werner Aigner

14413-038001/2003P00303US

8901

54975 7590 06/04/2007  
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP  
10 ST. JAMES AVENUE  
11th Floor  
BOSTON, MA 02116-3889

EXAMINER

CHEN, QING

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2191

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/04/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/657,726	<b>Applicant(s)</b> AIGNER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Qing Chen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 March 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to the amendment filed on May 18, 2007.
2. **Claims 1-41** are pending.
3. **Claims 1-41** have been amended.
4. The objections to the drawings are withdrawn in view of Applicant's submission of the correctly labeled replacement drawings, arguments, and amendments to the specification.
5. The objection to the title is maintained in view of Applicant's amendments to the title.
6. The objection to the abstract is withdrawn in view of Applicant's arguments.
7. The objections to the specification are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments to the specification. However, Applicant's amendments to the specification fail to fully address the objection due to the use of trademarks. Accordingly, this objection is maintained and further explained below.
8. The objections to Claims 17 and 26 are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments to the claims. However, Applicant's amendments to Claim 27 fail to fully address the objection due to a typographical error. Accordingly, this objection is maintained and further explained below.
9. The 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections of Claims 9-31 and 34-41 are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments to the claims. However, Applicant's amendments to Claims 32 and 33 fail to fully address the rejections due to insufficient antecedent basis. Accordingly, these rejections are maintained and further explained below.
10. The 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections of Claims 1-14 and 25-41 due to functional descriptive material and natural phenomenon are maintained in view of Applicant's arguments and amendments to the claims and further explained below. The 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections of Claims

Art Unit: 2191

15-24 due to lack of tangible result are withdrawn in view of the Office's current policies regarding non-statutory subject matter.

### ***Response to Amendment***

#### ***Specification***

11. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Business software application framework for developing and implementing a composite application.

12. The use of trademarks, such as JAVA, JSP, J2EE, EJB, JAVASCRIPT, INTERNET EXPLORER, and NETSCAPE NAVIGATOR, has been noted in this application. Trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear (capitalize each letter OR accompany each trademark with an appropriate designation symbol, *e.g.*, <sup>TM</sup> or ®) and be accompanied by the generic terminology (use trademarks as adjectives modifying a descriptive noun, *e.g.*, "the JAVA programming language").

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

#### ***Claim Objections***

13. **Claims 27 and 29-33** are objected to because of the following informalities:

Art Unit: 2191

- **Claim 27** contains a typographical error: the phrase “wherein generating a executable code further comprises ...” should presumably read “wherein generating executable code for a composite application further comprises ...” Note that the letter “a” should be deleted.
- **Claims 29-33** contain a typographical error: “being operable” should read -- being further operable --.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

14. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

15. **Claims 32 and 33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**Claims 32 and 33** recite the limitation “the business object.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. In the interest of compact prosecution, the Examiner subsequently interprets this limitation as reading “a business object” for the purpose of further examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

16. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

17. **Claims 1-14 and 25-41** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

**Claims 1-14 and 34-41** are directed to frameworks. However, the recited components of the frameworks appear to lack the necessary physical components (hardware) to constitute a machine or manufacture under § 101. Despite the recitation of the frameworks as being computer-implemented, there is no intrinsic evidence of any hardware element in the claims indicative of the frameworks as encompassing either a machine or manufacture under § 101. Therefore, these claim limitations can be reasonably interpreted as computer program modules—software *per se*. Furthermore, the specification discloses that various implementations of the systems and techniques may be realized in firmware and/or software (*see Page 54, Paragraph [00188]*). Therefore, the claims are directed to functional descriptive material *per se*, and hence non-statutory.

The claims constitute computer programs representing computer listings *per se*. Such descriptions or expressions of the programs are not physical “things.” They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not “acts” being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer, which permit the computer

Art Unit: 2191

program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element, which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer, that permits the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See *Lowry*, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035.

**Claims 25-33** recite information carrier as a claimed element, which is intrinsic evidence of electrical signals. Consequently, the information carrier can be reasonably interpreted as carrying electrical signals.

Claims that recite nothing but the physical characteristics of a form of energy, such as a frequency, voltage, or the strength of a magnetic field, define energy or magnetism *per se*, and as such are nonstatutory natural phenomena. *O'Reilly v. Morse*, 56 U.S. (15 How.) 62, 112-14 (1853). Moreover, it does not appear that a claim reciting a signal encoded with functional descriptive material falls within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in § 101.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

18. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

19. **Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21-26, 28, and 30-33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Burke et al.** (US 6,789,252).

As per **Claim 1**, Burke et al. disclose:

- an object access layer operable to exchange data with a plurality of enterprise base systems and to present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface (*see Figures 30-34; Column 34: 20-29, "As shown in FIG. 30, the preferred deployment environment includes an integration framework for providing an interface between the business object definition system of the invention and existing enterprise applications." and "The integration framework enables the business object definition system to receive and distribute data to create a seamless gateway between the business object definition system and existing enterprise systems."*);
- a service layer operable to provide services to the composite application (*see Figures 30-34; Column 40: 51-61, "The Product Composition System component provides for the creation and manipulation of product specifications and other order-related business objects."*



Art Unit: 2191

and *“The Order Management System functionality (which is founded on the Business Object Definition System functionality) includes order management, product composition, pricing, credit check, customer management, and session security.”*); and

- a user interface layer operable to provide user interface patterns that facilitate information exchange between the composite application and a user (*see Figures 30-34; Column 24: 64-66, “The Explorer and Instance Editor allow a user to view, add, change or delete an instance of object definition.”*).

As per **Claim 2**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein a composite application comprises business objects, business services, and business processes, wherein a business service comprises an action performed on a business object, and a business process comprises a combination of business services (*see Column 37: 65-67 through Column 38: 1-28, “A Product Composition System assembled in accordance with the invention provides users with an ability to easily and quickly define new products, dynamically define new attributes, create any required specification or definition, and formalize knowledge ...” and “The business object definition system provides the Product Composition System with attribute-based specification definition, composition and revision control for product models, customer product preferences, manufacturing capabilities, and operator instructions among others.”*).

Art Unit: 2191

As per **Claim 3**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- a database for composite application data, wherein the object access layer is further operable to provide local persistency in the database (*see Column 34: 6-8, "The database server computer 146 also is configured with a SQL relational database system (RDBMS) for creating and maintaining the database."*).

As per **Claim 5**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- a collaboration services module operable to provide a collaboration service to the composite application (*see Column 52: 50-54, "A Collaborative Design System can be assembled using the business object definition system components in accordance with the invention. Such a Collaborative Design System will allow multiple parties participate in the design and specification of a business object."*); and

- a workflow services module operable to provide a workflow to the composite application (*see Column 53: 21-30, "Requirements for activity addressing satisfaction of a demand can be formalized as workflows. The invention can be used to create a process to direct and control workflow carried out in the satisfaction of the demand."*).

As per **Claim 6**, the rejection of **Claim 5** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

Art Unit: 2191

- wherein the collaboration services module is operable to link a semantic object to a business object of the composite application (*see Column 51: 55-59, "The Business Object Definition System provides the ability to form a hierarchical semantic network of knowledge nodes. The objects present at these nodes may take the form of object definitions according to the invention."*).

As per **Claim 7**, the rejection of **Claim 5** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein a workflow comprises templates; workflow patterns, and actions, a template describing a workflow procedure, workflow patterns describing portions of the template, and actions executing functions to carry out the workflow patterns (*see Column 38: 49-61, "... a user creates templates (i.e. models) for the instantiation of different types of specifications. Each template can contain the allowed content along with all the criteria and rules required to create and modify specification instances. All specifications are configurable via their model definitions. The definitions consisting of ingrediential attribute objects and relationship role objects are modeled into user-definable contextual views or logical groupings called "partitions". Partitions serve as user configurable contexts to capture and apply use. Use of the business object definition system guarantees that all specifications regardless of the type will have the same look and feel."*).

As per **Claim 8**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

Art Unit: 2191

- wherein the service layer further comprises a container for composite application services, the container operable to provide interfaces for non-framework-generated code (*see Column 40: 44-46, "The Order Management System uses the Integration Framework previously described to link and collaborate with both internal and external systems."*).

As per **Claim 9**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein the user interface layer further comprises a user interface framework that separates user interface elements from the composite application so that the user interface layer is decoupled from the logic (*see Column 30: 25-31, "The client software, referred to herein as a browser, resides on the user's client computer, and allows the user to create a search request and send that request into the Internet for processing."*).

As per **Claim 10**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- a business object modeler operable to provide a user interface for constructing a business object (*see Column 25: 6-18, "The Enterprise Explorer software component allows a user to all definitional content of an object from one user interface." and "The user can also execute the following functions against the selected component: Create, Clone, Compose, Compare, Applicability Determination, Capability Assessment, Derive, Renew and Delete."*);

and

Art Unit: 2191

- a business object generator operable to generate an executable version of a modeled business object (*see Column 52: 66-67 through Column 53: 1-7, "A Business Wizard can be used to create a new business application function using the business object definition system in accordance with the present invention."*).

As per **Claim 11**, the rejection of **Claim 10** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein the business object modeler comprises an object modeler and a relation modeler (*see Column 18: 32-39, "Company-specific and/or industry-specific ontologies, consisting of a lexicon of predefined ingrediential objects and values in taxonomic form, can be defined to the system as business objects. Content-wise they are organized into various conceptual structures that represent the taxonomies of given industry vertical or product groups."*).

As per **Claim 12**, the rejection of **Claim 10** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein the business object generator comprises a generator framework and a persistency generator (*see Column 53: 1-7, "Using the business object definition system, one can view a business process (e.g., Engineering Change Order, Change Approval, Specification Preparation, Order Management, Negotiated Bid, etc) as a set of components that can include the following: Demands, Objects of Activity, Demand Satisfaction Processes ..."*).

As per **Claim 13**, the rejection of **Claim 10** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein the business object generator is operable to code a business object template with metadata and relation data for a business object to generate an executable version of a modeled business object (*see Column 38: 51-53, "Each template can contain the allowed content along with all the criteria and rules required to create and modify specification instances."*).

As per **Claim 15**, Burke et al. disclose:

- generating executable code for a composite application (*see Column 52: 66-67 through Column 53: 1-7, "A Business Wizard can be used to create a new business application function using the business object definition system in accordance with the present invention."*);

- exchanging data with a plurality of enterprise base systems (*see Column 34: 20-29, "The integration framework enables the business object definition system to receive and distribute data to create a seamless gateway between the business object definition system and existing enterprise systems."*);

- presenting enterprise base system data to the composite application through a uniform interface (*see Column 34: 20-29, "As shown in FIG. 30, the preferred deployment environment includes an integration framework for providing an interface between the business object definition system of the invention and existing enterprise applications."*); and

Art Unit: 2191

- facilitating a user's interaction with the composite application through user interface patterns (see Column 24: 64-66, *"The Explorer and Instance Editor allow a user to view, add, change or delete an instance of object definition."*).

As per **Claim 16**, the rejection of **Claim 15** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein generating executable code for a composite application comprises coding a template with business object metadata and relation data (see Column 38: 51-53, *"Each template can contain the allowed content along with all the criteria and rules required to create and modify specification instances."*).

As per **Claim 18**, the rejection of **Claim 15** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein a composite application comprises business objects, business services, and business processes, wherein a business service comprises an action performed on a business object, and a business process comprises a combination of business services (see Column 37: 65-67 through Column 38: 1-28, *"A Product Composition System assembled in accordance with the invention provides users with an ability to easily and quickly define new products, dynamically define new attributes, create any required specification or definition, and formalize knowledge ..."* and *"The business object definition system provides the Product Composition System with attribute-based specification definition, composition and revision control for product models,*

Art Unit: 2191

*customer product preferences, manufacturing capabilities, and operator instructions among others.").*

As per **Claim 19**, the rejection of **Claim 15** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- providing local persistency in a database for composite application data (*see Column 34: 6-8, "The database server computer 146 also is configured with a SQL relational database system (RDBMS) for creating and maintaining the database."*).

As per **Claim 21**, the rejection of **Claim 15** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- providing a collaboration service to the composite application (*see Column 52: 50-54, "A Collaborative Design System can be assembled using the business object definition system components in accordance with the invention. Such a Collaborative Design System will allow multiple parties participate in the design and specification of a business object."*); and
- providing a workflow to the composite application (*see Column 53: 21-30, "Requirements for activity addressing satisfaction of a demand can be formalized as workflows. The invention can be used to create a process to direct and control workflow carried out in the satisfaction of the demand."*).

As per **Claim 22**, the rejection of **Claim 15** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:



Art Unit: 2191

- providing a container for composite application services, the container operable to provide interfaces for non-framework-generated code portions (*see Column 40: 44-46, "The Order Management System uses the Integration Framework previously described to link and collaborate with both internal and external systems."*).

As per **Claim 23**, the rejection of **Claim 15** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- providing user interfaces to model the composite application, the user interfaces allowing specification of attributes and relations for a business object of the composite application (*see Column 25: 6-18, "The Enterprise Explorer software component allows a user to all definitional content of an object from one user interface." and "The user can also execute the following functions against the selected component: Create, Clone, Compose, Compare, Applicability Determination, Capability Assessment, Derive, Renew and Delete."*).

As per **Claim 24**, the rejection of **Claim 23** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- generating metadata for the business object and relations based on specifications (*see Column 26: 39-41, "Rules which themselves are object definitions can be attached to other objects or object definition ingredients using a drag and drop tactic."*).

As per **Claim 25**, Burke et al. disclose:

Art Unit: 2191

- generate executable code for a composite application (*see Column 52: 66-67 through Column 53: 1-7, "A Business Wizard can be used to create a new business application function using the business object definition system in accordance with the present invention."*);
- exchange data with a plurality of enterprise base systems (*see Column 34: 20-29, "The integration framework enables the business object definition system to receive and distribute data to create a seamless gateway between the business object definition system and existing enterprise systems."*);
- present enterprise base system data to the composite application through a uniform interface (*see Column 34: 20-29, "As shown in FIG. 30, the preferred deployment environment includes an integration framework for providing an interface between the business object definition system of the invention and existing enterprise applications."*); and
- generate user interfaces for facilitating interaction between the composite application and a user by using user interface patterns (*see Column 24: 64-66, "The Explorer and Instance Editor allow a user to view, add, change or delete an instance of object definition."*).

As per **Claim 26**, the rejection of **Claim 25** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein generating executable code for a composite application comprises coding a template with business object metadata and relation data (*see Column 38: 51-53, "Each template can contain the allowed content along with all the criteria and rules required to create and modify specification instances."*).

Art Unit: 2191

As per **Claim 28**, the rejection of **Claim 25** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- provide local persistency in a database for composite application data (*see Column 34: 6-8, "The database server computer 146 also is configured with a SQL relational database system (RDBMS) for creating and maintaining the database."*).

As per **Claim 30**, the rejection of **Claim 25** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- provide a collaboration service to the composite application (*see Column 52: 50-54, "A Collaborative Design System can be assembled using the business object definition system components in accordance with the invention. Such a Collaborative Design System will allow multiple parties participate in the design and specification of a business object."*); and

- provide a workflow to the composite application (*see Column 53: 21-30, "Requirements for activity addressing satisfaction of a demand can be formalized as workflows. The invention can be used to create a process to direct and control workflow carried out in the satisfaction of the demand."*).

As per **Claim 31**, the rejection of **Claim 25** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- provide a container for composite application services, the container operable to provide interfaces for non-framework-generated code portions (*see Column 40: 44-46, "The*

Art Unit: 2191

*Order Management System uses the Integration Framework previously described to link and collaborate with both internal and external systems."*).

As per **Claim 32**, the rejection of **Claim 25** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- provide user interfaces to model a business object, the user interfaces enabling specification of attributes and relations for a business object of the composite application (see Column 25: 6-18, *"The Enterprise Explorer software component allows a user to all definitional content of an object from one user interface."* and *"The user can also execute the following functions against the selected component: Create, Clone, Compose, Compare, Applicability Determination, Capability Assessment, Derive, Renew and Delete."*).

As per **Claim 33**, the rejection of **Claim 32** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- generate metadata for a business object and relations based on specifications (see Column 26: 39-41, *"Rules which themselves are object definitions can be attached to other objects or object definition ingredients using a drag and drop tactic."*).

Art Unit: 2191

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. **Claims 4, 20, 29, 34-36, and 38-41** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Burke et al.** (US 6,789,252) in view of **Mukundan et al.** (US 6,901,595).

As per **Claim 4**, the rejection of **Claim 3** is incorporated; however, **Burke et al.** do not disclose:

- wherein the object access layer is further operable to provide data synchronization and replication of enterprise base system data in the database.

**Mukundan et al.** disclose:

- wherein the object access layer is further operable to provide data synchronization and replication of enterprise base system data in the database (*see Column 6: 46-51, "... server programs are designed and configured to perform one or more specific functions or jobs including ... processing to support mobile web clients for data synchronization and replication ... "*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of **Mukundan et al.** into the teaching of **Burke et al.** to include wherein the object access layer is further operable to provide data synchronization

Art Unit: 2191

and replication of enterprise base system data in the database. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to update both the local and the server database (see Mukundan et al. – Column 5: 53-55).

As per **Claim 20**, the rejection of **Claim 19** is incorporated; however, Burke et al. do not disclose:

- providing data synchronization and replication of enterprise base system data in the database.

Mukundan et al. disclose:

- providing data synchronization and replication of enterprise base system data in the database (see Column 6: 46-51, "... server programs are designed and configured to perform one or more specific functions or jobs including ... processing to support mobile web clients for data synchronization and replication ...").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Mukundan et al. into the teaching of Burke et al. to include providing data synchronization and replication of enterprise base system data in the database. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to update both the local and the server database (see Mukundan et al. – Column 5: 53-55).

As per **Claim 29**, the rejection of **Claim 28** is incorporated; however, Burke et al. do not disclose:

Art Unit: 2191

- provide data synchronization and replication of enterprise base system data in the database.

Mukundan et al. disclose:

- provide data synchronization and replication of enterprise base system data in the database (*see Column 6: 46-51, "... server programs are designed and configured to perform one or more specific functions or jobs including ... processing to support mobile web clients for data synchronization and replication ... "*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Mukundan et al. into the teaching of Burke et al. to include provide data synchronization and replication of enterprise base system data in the database. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to update both the local and the server database (*see Mukundan et al. – Column 5: 53-55*).

As per **Claim 34**, Burke et al. disclose:

- a database for composite application data (*see Column 34: 6-8, "The database server computer 146 also is configured with a SQL relational database system (RDBMS) for creating and maintaining the database."*);

- an object access layer operable to:

- exchange data with a plurality of enterprise base systems (*see Figures 30-34; Column 34: 20-29, "The integration framework enables the business object definition system to*

Art Unit: 2191

*receive and distribute data to create a seamless gateway between the business object definition system and existing enterprise systems. ")),*

- present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface (*see Figures 30-34; Column 34: 20-29, "As shown in FIG. 30, the preferred deployment environment includes an integration framework for providing an interface between the business object definition system of the invention and existing enterprise applications. ")), and*

- provide local persistency in the database (*see Column 34: 6-8, "The database server computer 146 also is configured with a SQL relational database system (RDBMS) for creating and maintaining the database. "));*

- a service layer comprising:
  - a collaboration services module operable to provide a collaboration service to the composite application (*see Column 52: 50-54, "A Collaborative Design System can be assembled using the business object definition system components in accordance with the invention. Such a Collaborative Design System will allow multiple parties participate in the design and specification of a business object. ")), and*

- a guided procedure services module operable to provide a guided procedure to the composite application (*see Column 53: 21-30, "Requirements for activity addressing satisfaction of a demand can be formalized as workflows. The invention can be used to create a process to direct and control workflow carried out in the satisfaction of the demand. "));*

- a user interface layer operable to provide user interface patterns for displaying information relating to the composite application, the user interface layer comprising a user interface framework that separates user interface elements from the composite application so that



Art Unit: 2191

the user interface layer is decoupled from the logic (*see Figures 30-34; Column 24: 64-66, "The Explorer and Instance Editor allow a user to view, add, change or delete an instance of object definition."; Column 30: 25-31, "The client software, referred to herein as a browser, resides on the user's client computer, and allows the user to create a search request and send that request into the Internet for processing.";*

- a business object modeler operable to provide a user interface for constructing a business object of the composite application (*see Column 25: 6-18, "The Enterprise Explorer software component allows a user to all definitional content of an object from one user interface." and "The user can also execute the following functions against the selected component: Create, Clone, Compose, Compare, Applicability Determination, Capability Assessment, Derive, Renew and Delete.";* and

- a business object generator operable to generate an executable version of a modeled business object (*see Column 52: 66-67 through Column 53: 1-7, "A Business Wizard can be used to create a new business application function using the business object definition system in accordance with the present invention.";*

However, Burke et al. do not disclose:

- provide data synchronization and replication of enterprise base system data in the database.

Mukundan et al. disclose:

- provide data synchronization and replication of enterprise base system data in the database (*see Column 6: 46-51, "... server programs are designed and configured to perform*

Art Unit: 2191

*one or more specific functions or jobs including ... processing to support mobile web clients for data synchronization and replication ...").*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Mukundan et al. into the teaching of Burke et al. to include provide data synchronization and replication of enterprise base system data in the database. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to update both the local and the server database (*see Mukundan et al. – Column 5: 53-55*).

As per **Claim 35**, the rejection of **Claim 34** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein the business object modeler comprises an object modeler and a relation modeler (*see Column 18: 32-39, "Company-specific and/or industry-specific ontologies, consisting of a lexicon of predefined ingrediential objects and values in taxonomic form, can be defined to the system as business objects. Content-wise they are organized into various conceptual structures that represent the taxonomies of given industry vertical or product groups."*).

As per **Claim 36**, the rejection of **Claim 34** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein the business object generator comprises a generator framework and a persistency generator (*see Column 53: 1-7, "Using the business object definition system, one can*

Art Unit: 2191

*view a business process (e.g., Engineering Change Order, Change Approval, Specification Preparation, Order Management, Negotiated Bid, etc) as a set of components that can include the following: Demands, Objects of Activity, Demand Satisfaction Processes ...").*

As per **Claim 38**, the rejection of **Claim 34** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein a composite application comprises business objects, business services, and business processes, wherein a business service comprises an action performed on a business object, and a business process comprises a combination of business services (*see Column 37: 65-67 through Column 38: 1-28, "A Product Composition System assembled in accordance with the invention provides users with an ability to easily and quickly define new products, dynamically define new attributes, create any required specification or definition, and formalize knowledge ..." and "The business object definition system provides the Product Composition System with attribute-based specification definition, composition and revision control for product models, customer product preferences, manufacturing capabilities, and operator instructions among others."*).

As per **Claim 39**, the rejection of **Claim 34** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein the collaboration services module is operable to link a semantic object to a business object of the composite application (*see Column 51: 55-59, "The Business Object Definition System provides the ability to form a hierarchical semantic network of knowledge*

Art Unit: 2191

*nodes. The objects present at these nodes may take the form of object definitions according to the invention.").*

As per **Claim 40**, the rejection of **Claim 34** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein a guided procedure comprises templates, workflow patterns, and actions, a template describing a guided procedure, workflow patterns describing portions of the template, and actions executing functions to carry out the workflow patterns (*see Column 38: 49-61, "... a user creates templates (i.e. models) for the instantiation of different types of specifications. Each template can contain the allowed content along with all the criteria and rules required to create and modify specification instances. All specifications are configurable via their model definitions. The definitions consisting of ingrediential attribute objects and relationship role objects are modeled into user-definable contextual views or logical groupings called "partitions". Partitions serve as user configurable contexts to capture and apply use. Use of the business object definition system guarantees that all specifications regardless of the type will have the same look and feel."*).

As per **Claim 41**, the rejection of **Claim 34** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein the service layer further comprises a container for composite application services, the container operable to provide interfaces for non-framework-generated code (*see*

Art Unit: 2191

*Column 40: 44-46, "The Order Management System uses the Integration Framework previously described to link and collaborate with both internal and external systems.").*

22. **Claims 14, 17, and 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Burke et al.** (US 6,789,252) in view of **Ireland et al.** (US 6,266,666).

As per **Claim 14**, the rejection of **Claim 13** is incorporated; however, **Burke et al.** do not disclose:

- wherein the business object generator is further operable to generate tables and proxies for a business object.

**Ireland et al.** disclose:

- wherein the business object generator is further operable to generate tables and proxies for a business object (*see Column 8: 60-62, "When the system generates a stub for Java or a proxy for ActiveX, the system makes tabular results available through standard interfaces."*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of **Ireland et al.** into the teaching of **Burke et al.** to include wherein the business object generator is further operable to generate tables and proxies for a business object. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide both component-based development and tabular data (*see Ireland et al. – Column 9: 1-4*).

Art Unit: 2191

As per **Claim 17**, the rejection of **Claim 16** is incorporated; however, Burke et al. do not disclose:

- wherein generating executable code for a composite application further comprises generating tables and proxies for a business object.

Ireland et al. disclose:

- wherein generating executable code for a composite application further comprises generating tables and proxies for a business object (*see Column 8: 60-62, "When the system generates a stub for Java or a proxy for ActiveX, the system makes tabular results available through standard interfaces."*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Ireland et al. into the teaching of Burke et al. to include wherein generating executable code for a composite application further comprises generating tables and proxies for a business object. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide both component-based development and tabular data (*see Ireland et al. – Column 9: 1-4*).

As per **Claim 27**, the rejection of **Claim 26** is incorporated; however, Burke et al. do not disclose:

- wherein generating executable code for a composite application further comprises generating tables and proxies for a business object.

Ireland et al. disclose:

- wherein generating executable code for a composite application further comprises generating tables and proxies for a business object (*see Column 8: 60-62, "When the system generates a stub for Java or a proxy for ActiveX, the system makes tabular results available through standard interfaces."*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Ireland et al. into the teaching of Burke et al. to include wherein generating executable code for a composite application further comprises generating tables and proxies for a business object. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide both component-based development and tabular data (*see Ireland et al. – Column 9: 1-4*).

23. **Claim 37** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Burke et al.** (US 6,789,252) in view of **Mukundan et al.** (US 6,901,595) as applied to Claim 36 above, and further in view of **Ireland et al.** (US 6,266,666).

As per **Claim 37**, the rejection of **Claim 36** is incorporated; and Burke et al. further disclose:

- wherein the business object generator is operable to code a business object template with metadata and relation data for a business object to generate an executable version of the business object (*see Column 38: 51-53, "Each template can contain the allowed content along with all the criteria and rules required to create and modify specification instances."*).

However, Burke et al. and Mukundan et al. do not disclose:

Art Unit: 2191

- to generate tables and proxies for a business object.

Ireland et al. disclose:

- to generate tables and proxies for a business object (*see Column 8: 60-62, "When the system generates a stub for Java or a proxy for ActiveX, the system makes tabular results available through standard interfaces."*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Ireland et al. into the teaching of Burke et al. to include to generate tables and proxies for a business object. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide both component-based development and tabular data (*see Ireland et al. – Column 9: 1-4*).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

24. Applicant's arguments filed on May 18, 2007 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

***In the remarks, Applicant argues that:***

- a) Claim 1, as amended, recites "an object access layer operable to exchange data with a plurality of enterprise base systems and to present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface."

Burke fails to describe or disclose an object access layer. More specifically, Burke is devoid of an object access layer.



Claim 1, as amended, recites "a service layer operable to provide services to the composite application." Burke fails to describe or disclose a service layer.

Burke merely discloses an application component layer, an application architecture layer and a technical architecture layer that makes up software architecture layers (Burke, FIG. 34) or a framework, without further explanation. In Burke's FIG. 34, the application component layer is labeled as "customer profile / pricing / order capture / credit compose / clone / compare / find / derive / lifecycle." The application architecture layer is labeled as "Workflow/business rules / security object / activity / associate / location / item demand /job / queue / statement / deliverable." The technical architecture layer is labeled as "OS / GUI / network / APP server / web server RDBMS / OLIP / HW / ORB / security / TR / PA." Burke provides no numerals for the layers in FIG. 34.

***Examiner's response:***

a) Examiner disagrees. Burke et al. clearly disclose "an object access layer operable to exchange data with a plurality of enterprise base systems and to present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface (*see Figures 30-34; Column 34: 20-29, "As shown in FIG. 30, the preferred deployment environment includes an integration framework for providing an interface between the business object definition system of the invention and existing enterprise applications."* and "*The integration framework enables the business object definition system to receive and distribute data to create a seamless gateway between the business object definition system and existing enterprise systems.*")". Note that Figure 34 is a more detailed

Art Unit: 2191

block diagram of the software architecture layers of the system of Figure 33, which depicts the software architecture and content of a business software system.

Burke et al. also clearly disclose “a service layer operable to provide services to the composite application (*see Figures 30-34; Column 40: 51-61, “The Product Composition System component provides for the creation and manipulation of product specifications and other order-related business objects.” and “The Order Management System functionality (which is founded on the Business Object Definition System functionality) includes order management, product composition, pricing, credit check, customer management, and session security.”*)”

***In the remarks, Applicant argues that:***

b) Claims 15 and 25, as amended, recite “facilitating a user's interaction with the composite application through user interface patterns,” or similar language. Burke fails to describe or disclose this quoted claim feature.

To the contrary, Burke discloses patterns in the context of object definition/specification instances:

One preferred embodiment of a business object definition system in accordance with the invention uses Explorer or Instance Editor transactions (discussed below) to create machine processable, application independent, model definitions that capture knowledge as reusable chunks that become the patterns for all object definition/specification instances needed in the business. [Burke, col, 19, lines 6-12]

Accordingly, claims 15 and 25 are not anticipated by Burke.

***Examiner's response:***

Art Unit: 2191

b) Examiner disagrees. Burke et al. clearly disclose “facilitating a user’s interaction with the composite application through user interface patterns (*see Column 24: 64-66, “The Explorer and Instance Editor allow a user to view, add, change or delete an instance of object definition.”*).”

### ***Conclusion***

25. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Qing Chen whose telephone number is 571-270-1071. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.


Art Unit: 2191

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen, can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

QC / QC  
May 24, 2007



WEI ZHEN  
SUPERVISOR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER